UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/366,858	08/04/1999	WILLIAM DRENTTEL	HD-100US	3583

43399 7590 02/28/2005

EVELYN M. SOMMER
250 PARK AVE
RM 825
NEW YORK, NY 10221

EXAMINER	
HUYNH, THU V	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 02/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/366,858	DRENTTEL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thu V Huynh	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 December 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-6 and 8-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-6 and 8-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed on 12/06/2004 to application filed on 09/04/1999.

2. Claims 1, 3-6, and 8-15, 17-22 are amended.

3. Claims 1, 3-6, and 8-22 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, 11, and 15 are independent claims.

4. The rejections of claims 3-6, and 8-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, have been withdrawn in view of the amendment.

5. The rejections of claims 1, 3-6, 8-13, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, have been withdrawn in view of the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
>
> (b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. **Claims 1, 3-6, 8-14, 17, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Microsoft FrontPage 98 (herein after FrontPage), copyright 1997 by Sams.net Publishing, pages 359-381 in view of England, US 6,144,991 filed 02/1998.

Regarding independent claim 1, FrontPage teaches Front Page software program provides a template for the display of information, said template having a display area with a dimensional configuration of a height of approximately a first whole number of dimensional units and a width of approximately a second whole number of dimensional units (FrontPage, page 367 line 14 – page 368 line 24; page 363, line 10 – page 364, line 5; and fig. 18.4, many templates such as "Banner and Contents, Footer, Header, Footer and Contents, Vertical Split" template), said template comprising a plurality of grids combined and arranged together to fill the entire display area of said template (FrontPage, page 363, fig.18.4; page 364, fig.18.5, each template has different number of frames and layout), wherein grids of desired length-to-width ratio of dimensions are used to form all display components filling the entire display area of said template data structure, such that the grids forming all display components can be readily proportioned by the desired dimensional unit ratio in the template data structure to fit together in whole numbers of dimensional units to fill the entire display area of the template data structure (FrontPage, page 364, fig.18.5) and the proportioning of said grids is automatically maintained during operation of the grids of the template data structure (FrontPage, page 365, lines 23 – page 369, lines 16, user defines desired length-to-width ratio of frames in a frameset and this ratio is automatically maintained during configuring frames' properties, such as "borderless frames" and/or resizing frames to occupy some percentage of the entire frame).

Although the use of only grids being dimensioned to have *approximately a two dimensional unit by one dimensional unit* configuration are not explicitly disclosed, FrontPage

implementation obviously use such grids and grids' dimensional information to allow the user to create new frameset and frames, as well as to add (split) and delete frames (FrontPage, page 363 lines 10-22 and page 365 lines 3-22).

England teaches the step of providing predefined different frame layouts and framesets includes grid dimensions (England, col.10, line 53 – col.11, lines 19 and fig.4).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined England and FrontPage to provide "each of said grids being dimensioned to have approximately a two dimensional unit by one dimensional unit configuration", since this would have provided the user with different template layout configuration.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, FrontPage and England teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. FrontPage teaches wherein at least one of said grids is further subdivided into two sub-grids (FrontPage, page 365 lines 3-13). However, FrontPage does not explicitly disclose each subdivided having an approximately one dimensional unit by one dimensional unit configuration.

England teaches the step of providing different frame layouts and grid dimensions (England, fig.4).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined England and FrontPage to provide "each subdivided having an approximately one dimension unit by one dimension unit configuration", two-by-one

dimensional unit configuration, or any different desired dimensional unit configuration, since this would have provided the user with different layout configuration.

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, FrontPage and England teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. FrontPage teaches wherein said template is provided in a Web authoring program for generating pages for display with a browser program, said grids comprising frames in which information may be entered, through said authoring program and displayed via said browser program (FrontPage, page 359; page 360, lines 1-13; and page 371, lines 1-20, generating web pages for display with a browser program and separately adding/editing the content of a frame page in a full browser window).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, FrontPage and England teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. FrontPage teaches wherein said template is provided within a software program, said girds comprising frames in which information may be entered to said software program and displayed via said software program (FrontPage, page 359, last paragraph; page 363, line 10 – page 364, line 5; figure 18.4; and page 371-375; Front Page software program provides templates comprising frames to create and edit contents in the frames of web pages in What You See Is What You Get mode).

Claim 6 is for a computer system performing the method combination of claims 1 and 3, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent on claim 1, FrontPage and England teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. The limitation of "wherein said operation on the grid is selected from at least one of the following: repositioning, resizing and reorienting" is addressed. The rationale is incorporated herein.

Claims 8-10 and 19 are for a computer system performing the method of claims 3-5 and 17, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 11, FrontPage teaches a method arranging information, including text and graphic images, in a template having a display area with a dimensional configuration of a height of approximately a first whole number of dimensional units and a width of approximately a second whole number of dimensional units, wherein grids of the desired length-to-width ratio of dimensions are used to form all display component filling the entire display area of said template data structure, such that the grids forming all display components can be readily proportioned desired dimension unit ratio in the template data structure to fit together in whole number of dimensional units to fill the entire display area to the template data structure (FrontPage, page 367 line 14 to page 368 line 24; and page 375, lines 1-20). FrontPage teaches providing at least one template (FronPage, page 363, line 10 – page 364, line 5; and fig. 18.4, many templates such as "Banner and Contents, Footer, Header, Footer and Contents, Vertical Split" template, each has different number of frames and layout) subdivided into a plurality of grids combined and arranged together to fill the entire display area of said template (FrontPage, page 363, fig.18.4 and page 378, fig.18.6), wherein a desired length-to-width ratio of

said grids is automatically maintained during operation of the grids of the template data structure to generate a resulting display (FrontPage, page 365, lines 23 – page 369, lines 16, user defines desired length-to-width ratio of frames in a frameset and this ratio is automatically maintained during configuring frames' properties, such as creating borderless, resizing the frames).

FrontPage implementation obviously uses such grids and grids' dimensional information to allow the user to create new frameset and frames, as well as to add (split) and delete frames (FrontPage, page 363 lines 10-22 and page 365 lines 3-22). However, FrontPage does not explicitly disclose each subdivided having an approximately two-by-one dimensional configuration.

England teaches the step of providing predefined different frame layouts and grid dimensions (England, col.10, line 53 – col.11, lines 19 and fig.4).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined England and FrontPage to provide "each of said grids has approximate two-by-one dimensional configuration", one-by-one dimensional unit configuration, or any different desired dimensional unit configuration, since this would have provided the user with different template layout configuration.

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, FrontPage and England teach the limitations of claim 11 as explained above. Refer to the rationale relied to reject claim 11, "providing a plurality of templates, each said template having a different arrangement of grids" is addressed.

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent on claim 11, FrontPage and England teach the limitations of claim 11 as explained above. FrontPage teaches separately entering information into each of said grids such that said template displays different information in said grids (FrontPage, 371-375, separately adding different content to left, top and main frame).

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent on claim 11, FrontPage and England teach the limitations of claim 11 as explained above. FrontPage teaches the template is provided for in a Web authoring program for generating pages for display with a browser program in which information may be entered, through said authoring program and displayed via said browser program (FrontPage, page 359; page 360, lines 1-13; and page 371, lines 1-20, generating web pages for display with a browser program and adding/editing the content of a frame page in a full browser window).

Regarding claim 21, which is dependent on claim 11, FrontPage and England teach the limitations of claim 11 as explained above. The limitation of "wherein said operation on the grid is selected from at least one of the following: repositioning, resizing and reorienting" is addressed. The rationale is incorporated herein.

8. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Microsoft FrontPage 98" (herein after FrontPage), copyright 1997 by Sams.net Publishing, pages 359-381 in view of England, US 6,144,991 filed 02/1998 and Courter et

al., "Mastering Microsoft Office 2000 Professional Edition", ISBN:0782123139, Pub. Date: February 1999, pages 105-145; 937-981; and 1031-1056.

Regarding independent claim 15, FrontPage teaches a method for displaying text and other information on a display, said text information having at least two formats, at least one of said formats having a horizontal directional orientation and at least one of said formats having a vertical directional orientation (FrontPage, page 367 line 14 to page 368 line 24; page 374, fig. 18.12, text in horizontal direction in top frame and vertical direction on left frame), said method comprising:

- creating a first screen display by dividing the area of the display defined by a first template data structure into first plurality of grids which are combined and arranged together to fill the entire area of the display, wherein grids of desired length-to-width ratio of dimensions are used to form all display components filling the entire display area of said template data structure (FrontPage, page 363, lines 10-16; and 365 lines 3-13, creating frameset using frame template and splitting a frame into two rows or columns), at least one of said first plurality of grids displaying said text information formatted in said horizontal directional orientation, said at least one grid having a horizontal orientation corresponding to the orientation of said textual information format (FrontPage, page 373, text information formatted in horizontal direction in top frame), wherein a desired length-to-width ratio of said grids is automatically maintained during operation of the grids of the template data structure to generate a resulting display (FrontPage, page 365, lines 23 – page 369, lines 16, user defines desired length-to-width ratio of frames in a frameset and this ratio is automatically

maintained during configuring frames' properties, such as creating borderless, resizing the frames to occupy some percentage of the entire frame); and

- creating second screen display by dividing the area of the display defined by a second template data structure into a second plurality of grids which are combined and arranged together to fill the entire area of the display, wherein grids of desired length-to-width ratio of dimensions are used to form all display components filling the entire display area of said template data structure (FrontPage, page 363, lines 10-16; and 365 lines 3-13, creating frameset using frame template and splitting a frame into two rows or columns), each said grid having a horizontal or vertical orientation, at least one of said second plurality of grids displaying said text information formatted in said vertical directional orientation, said at least one grid having a vertical orientation corresponding to the orientation of said textual information format (FrontPage, page 373, text information formatted in vertical direction in left frame), wherein a desired length-to-width ratio of said grids is automatically maintained during operation of the grids of the template data structure to generate a resulting display (FrontPage, page 365, lines 23 – page 369, lines 16, user defines desired length-to-width ratio of frames in a frameset and this ratio is automatically maintained during configuring frames' properties, such as creating borderless, resizing the frames to occupy some percentage of the entire frame).

FrontPage teaches that the user enables to configure the size of plurality of frames (FrontPage, page 367, lines 4-17). However, FrontPage does not explicitly disclose each of said first and second plurality grids being only dimensioned to have approximately a two dimensional

unit by one dimensional unit configuration; selecting a first format for text information from at least two format; and displaying said screen having said textual information corresponding to said selected format.

England teaches the step of providing predefined different frame layouts and grid dimensions (England, col.10, line 53 – col.11, lines 19 and fig.4).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined England and FrontPage to provide "grids being dimensioned to have approximately a two dimensional unit by one dimensional unit configuration", since this would have provided the user with different layout configuration to create desired frames.

However, England does not explicitly disclose selecting a first format for text information from at least two formats; and displaying said screen having said textual information corresponding to said selected format.

Courter teaches the steps of:

- selecting a first format for text information from at least two format (Courter, page 124, lines 15-36 and page 125, fig. 6.12); and
- displaying a screen having said textual information corresponding to said selected format (Courter, page 124, lines 15-36 and page 125, fig. 6.12).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Courter and FrontPage to provide tools for the user to format contents in frames, since this would have facilitated the user to layout an electronic document.

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, FrontPage, England, and Courter teach the limitations of claim 15 as explained above. Refer to the rationale relied to reject claim 15, FrontPage teaches at least one of said grids is further subdivided into two grids (FrontPage, page 365 lines 3-13, subdividing a frame into plurality of frames).

However FrontPage does not explicitly disclose each grid having an approximately one dimensional unit by one dimensional unit configuration.

England teaches the step of providing different frame layouts and grid dimensions (England, fig.4).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined England and FrontPage to provide "each subdivided having an approximately one dimension unit by one dimension unit configuration", two-by-one dimensional unit configuration, or any different desired dimensional unit configuration, since this would have provided the user with different layout configuration to create a desired frameset.

9. Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 11-13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courter et al., "Mastering Microsoft Office 2000 Professional Edition", ISBN:0782123139, Pub. Date: February 1999, pages 105-145; 937-981; and 1031-1056.

Regarding independent claim 15, Courter teaches a method for displaying text and other information on a display, said text information having at least two formats, at least one of said formats having a horizontal directional orientation and at least one of said formats having a

vertical directional orientation (Courter, page 124, line 1 – page 125, line 3), said method comprising:

- creating a first screen display by dividing the area of the display defined by a first template data structure into first plurality of grids which are combined and arranged together to fill the entire area of the display, wherein grids of desired length-to-width ratio of dimensions are used to form all display components filling the entire display area of said template data structure (Courter, page 121, line 8– page 122, line 11), each of said first plurality grids being dimensioned to have any dimensional unit configuration (Courter, page 121, line 35 – page 122, line 7, specifying exact measurements and formatting for the table by setting height/width of plurality grids when creating the table. This discloses that plurality grids dimensioned one- by-one, two-by-one, or any desired dimension), at least one of said first plurality of grids displaying said text information formatted in said horizontal directional orientation, said at least one grid having a horizontal orientation corresponding to the orientation of said textual information format (Courter, page 123, lines 3-6; page 124, line 15 – page 125, line 3), wherein a desired length-to-width ratio of said grids is automatically maintained during operation of the grids of the template data structure to generate a resulting display (Courter, page 136, last paragraph – page 138, user defines desired length-to-width ratio of grids in the table and this ratio is automatically maintained during configuring table's properties, such as coloring borders (grids/cells) of the table);

- creating second screen display by dividing the area of the display defined by a second template data structure into a second plurality of grids which are combined and arrange together to fill the entire area of the display, wherein grids of desired length-to-width ratio of dimensions are used to form all display components filling the entire display area of said template data structure (Courter, page 121, line 8– page 122, line 11), each of said second plurality of grids being dimensioned to have approximately a five dimensional unit by two dimensional unit configuration, each said grid having a horizontal or vertical orientation (Courter, page 121, line 35 – page 122, line 7, specifying exact measurements and formatting for the table by setting height/width of plurality grids when creating the table), at least one of said second plurality of grids displaying said text information formatted in said vertical directional orientation, said at least one grid having a vertical orientation corresponding to the orientation of said textual information format (Courter, page 123, lines 3-6; page 124, line 15 – page 125, line 3), wherein a desired length-to-width ratio of said grids is automatically maintained during operation of the grids of the template data structure to generate a resulting display (Courter, page 136, last paragraph – page 138, user defines desired length-to-width ratio of grids in the table and this ratio is automatically maintained during configuring table's properties, such as coloring borders (grids/cells) of the table);
- selecting a first format for said text information from said at least two format (Courter, page 124, lines 15-36 and page 125, fig. 6.12); and

- displaying said screen having said textual information corresponding to said selected format (Courter, page 124, lines 15-36 and page 125, fig. 6.12).

Courter does not explicitly disclose using only two-dimensional unit by one-dimensional unit. However, Courter teaches that any desired grids dimension is configured to apply to the displayed table as discussed above, which suggests the use of only grids dimensioned one-by-one, two-by-one, or any desired dimension are also configured by the user.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included grids with two by one dimensional unit, since it would have provided the user with different layout configuration to create a desired table.

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, Courter teaches the limitations of claim 15 as explained above. Courter teaches at least one of said grids is further subdivided into two sub-grids (Courter, page 134, lines 10-21 and fig. 6.20, splitting a grid (cell) into many grids (cells) which includes into two grids (cells)).

Claims 1 and 11 recites the limitation similar to claim 15 and are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Courter teaches wherein at least one of said grids is further subdivided into two sub-grids (Court, pages 133, "Merging and Splitting Cells" section – page 134, lines 10-21 and fig. 6.20). Court does not explicitly disclose each subdivided having an approximately one-dimensional unit by one-dimensional unit

configuration. However, Courter teaches that any desired grids dimension is configured to apply to the displayed table as discussed above, which suggests the use of only grids dimensioned one-by-one, two-by-one, or any desired dimension are also configured by the user.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included grids with two by one dimensional unit, since it would have provided the user with different layout configuration to create a desired table.

Claim 6 is for a computer system performing the method combination of claims 1 and 3, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 8 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 3 and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, Courter teaches providing a plurality of templates, each said template having a different arrangement of grids (Courter, page 121, line 8– page 122, line 11; pages 135-136).

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent on claim 11, Courter teaches separately entering information into each of said grids such that said template displays different information in said grids (Courter, page 123, "Entering and Editting text" section, separately adding different content).

10. Claims 18, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Courter as applied to claims 1, 6 and 11 as explained above, and further in view of Hargove, US 5,371,847, patented 1994.

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent on claim 1, However, Courter does not explicitly disclose that the template is provide at the level of the operating system and said grids comprising frames in which programs can be displayed.

Hargrove teaches a method and system provides a grid template for the display of information, said template having a display area with a dimensional configuration of a height of approximately a first whole number of dimensional units and a width of approximately a second whole number of dimensional units, said template comprising a plurality of grids combined and arranged together to fill the entire display area of said template (Hargrove, col.3, lines 23-58 and figures 1 and 8A-12B, displaying templates 8A and 11A comprising grids, each template has different number of frames (rows and columns), said template is provide at the level of the operating system and said grids comprising frames in which programs can be displayed (Hargrove, figures 1, 3-4, 6 and 8A-13B, the layout of fig.9B used for window arrangement of an operating system user-interface in Fig.1 in which programs, such as "Microsoft Word" and "Program Manager" can be displayed).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hargrove into Courter to provide the templates to both the level of operating system user-interface and a particular application, since this would have facilitated the user to manipulate of arrangement of windows for displaying programs in an operating system as well as information or documents in a web page.

Claim 20 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 18 and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 22, which is dependent on claim 11, teaches similar limitations of claim 18 and is rejected under the same rationale.

11. Claims 18, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft FrontPage 98 in view of England as applied to claims 1, 6 and 11 as explained above, and further in view of Hargove, US 5,371,847, patented 1994.

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent on claim 1, FrontPage and England teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. However, Frontpage does not explicitly disclose that the template is provide at the level of the operating system and said grids comprising frames in which programs can be displayed.

Hargrove teaches a method and system provides a grid template for the display of information, said template having a display area with a dimensional configuration of a height of approximately a first whole number of dimensional units and a width of approximately a second whole number of dimensional units, said template comprising a plurality of grids combined and arranged together to fill the entire display area of said template (Hargrove, col.3, lines 23-58 and figures 1 and 8A-12B, displaying templates 8A and 11A comprising grids, each template has different number of frames (rows and columns), said template is provide at the level of the operating system and said grids comprising frames in which programs can be displayed (Hargrove, figures 1, 3-4, 6 and 8A-13B, the layout of fig.9B used for window arrangement of an

operating system user-interface in Fig.1 in which programs, such as "Microsoft Word" and "Program Manager" can be displayed).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hargrove into FrontPage and England to provide the templates to both the level of operating system user-interface and a particular application, since this would have facilitated the user to manipulate of arrangement of windows for displaying programs in an operating system as well as information or documents in a web page.

Claim 20 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 18 and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 22, which is dependent on claim 11, teaches similar limitations of claim 18 and is rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 12/06/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that none of cited prior arts teaching the step of "only grids of the desired 2x1 unit length-to-width ratio of dimensions are used to form all display components filling the entire display area of said template data structure".

This is not persuasive. Using 2x1 unit length-to-width ratio of dimensions is one of among ratios used to create frames in Frontpage, England, or Courter's teaching.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Zine, US 5,762,561, filed 1996, teaches scorecard design automation.

Kraus et al., US 6,266,684, filed 1997, teaches Creating and saving multi-frame web pages.

Nojima et al., US 2002/0004805, filed 1997, teaches document processing storing and modifying data using effect data.

Bottomly, US 5,900002, filed 1995, teaches page layout in desktop publishing system.

Koba, US 6,222,947, filed 1998, teaches image editing.

Fukui et al., US 5,517,621, filed 1990, teaches document formatting with efficient layout manipulation.

Lynn et al., US 2003/0229856 A1, filed 2000, teaches text grid creation tools.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu V Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TVH
February 18, 2005

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER